



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,310	04/12/2004	Andre Lavoie	028750.0027-US02	2574
26853	7590	11/15/2006	EXAMINER	
COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2401			SINGH, RACHNA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Ifw

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,310	04/12/2004	Andre Lavoie	03883-P0022A	2574

7590
Andre Lavoie
396 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 06902

09/22/2006



EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/822,310	Applicant(s) LAVOIE ET AL.	
	Examiner Rachna Singh	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION:

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/07/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

3

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 04/12/04.
2. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 28, and 29 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

Regarding Provisional Application 60/461,386, the later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed provisional application, Application No. 60/461,386, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application.

Art Unit: 2176

Provisional Application 60/461,386 is drawn to a Powered rotary board turner which is not related to a financial document change identifier.

Furthermore, the application Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows: An application for patent for an invention disclosed in the manner provided by the first paragraph of **section 112** of this title in an application previously filed in the United States, or as provided by **section 363** of this title, which is filed by an inventor or inventors named in the previously filed application shall have the same effect, as to such invention, as though filed on the date of the prior application. The inventor(s) named in Provisional Application 60/461,386 do not match any of the names of the inventor(s) of the current application.

Applicant's claims for the benefit of Provisional Application 60/462,065 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 10/07/04 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 4-6, 7-8, 13-15, and 22-24 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Regarding claim 4, claim 1, from which claim 4 depends, requires the generation delta data indicative of ***at least one of change and percentage change***. Claim 1 only requires one of change or percentage change, not both. Thus claim 4 fails to further limit the subject matter of claim 1 because the claim requires the generation of only one of a change or percentage change.

Claims 5-6 are objected to for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claim from which they depend.

Regarding claims 7-8, claim 1, from which claims 7-8 depend, requires the generation delta data indicative of ***at least one of change and percentage change***. Claim 1 only requires one of change or percentage change, not both. Thus claims 7-8 fail to further limit the subject matter of claim 1 because the claim requires the generation of only one of a change or percentage change.

Regarding claim 13, claim 12, from which claim 13 depends, recites delivering ***at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data***. Thus although claim 13 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data as visually distinct from the tabular data, claim 12 only requires that one of these data be displayed; therefore, claim 13 fails to further limit the subject matter of claim 12.

Claim 14 is objected to for fully incorporating the deficiencies of its base claim from which it depends.

Regarding claim 15, claim 11, from which claim 15 depends, recites delivering ***at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data***. Thus although claim 15 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a variety of manners, claim 11 only requires that one of these data be displayed. Therefore, claim 15 fails to further limit the subject matter of claim 11.

Regarding claim 22, claim 21, from which claim 22 depends, recites delivering ***at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data***. Thus although claim 22 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data as visually distinct from the tabular data, claim 21 only requires that one of these data be displayed. Therefore, claim 22 fails to further limit the subject matter of claim 21.

Claim 23 is objected to for fully incorporating the deficiencies of its base claim from which it depends.

Regarding claim 24, claim 20 from which claim 24 depends, recites delivering at ***lest one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data***. Thus although claim 24 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a variety of manners, claim 20 only requires that one of these data be displayed. Therefore, claim 24 fails to further limit the subject matter of claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-2 and 9-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 1 is drawn to an apparatus for generating a comparison of related subject matter found in two different financial documents. Although the claim recites "to generate tabular delta data indicative of at least one of change and percentage change between the related subject matter of said first document tabular data and said second document tabular data", the tabular delta data is not necessarily

Art Unit: 2176

made available to a user and therefore remains in the abstract. Thus, claim 1 fails to produce a tangible result. In order for a claim to be drawn to statutory subject matter, it must be capable of producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result. In this case, although the result is concrete and useful, it is not tangible. Appropriate correction is required.

Dependent claims 2 and 9-27 do not appear to cure this problem and are therefore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claim from which they depend.

It is noted that dependent claims 3-6 recite features where the tabular delta data is delivered to a user interface, thus they are drawn to statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 28-29, like claim 1, also recite "to generate tabular delta data indicative of at least one of change and percentage change between the related subject matter of said first document tabular data and said second document tabular data". The claimed tabular delta data is not necessarily made available to a user and therefore remains in the abstract. Thus, claim 1 fails to produce a tangible result. In order for a claim to be drawn to statutory subject matter, it must be capable of producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result. In this case, although the result is concrete and useful, it is not tangible. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2176

8. Further, to expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of Applicant amending these claims to claim statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claim 1, 9-11, 16, 18-20, 25, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gay, US 6,792,145 B2, 09/14/04 (filed on 06/08/01)

Regarding claim 1, Gay teaches a pattern recognition process for text document interpretation. Gay teaches extracting textual and tabular data from financial documents. A comparison is made between the character strings of the financial document and the character strings provided in the previous financial documents which meets the preamble, ***an apparatus for generating a comparison of related subject matter found in two different financial documents***. See abstract. Gay teaches his

Art Unit: 2176

invention is directed to SEC documents such as 10-Q or 10-K financial documents which contain character strings in tabular form. See column 1, lines 35-45 and column 2, lines 23-52. Comparisons are made between a raw SEC document containing tabular information that has been downloaded from a website and a new SEC financial document which also contains tabular information which meets the limitations, ***a first document with at least a portion of said first document in a tabular data format; a second document with at least a portion of said second document in a tabular data format, said second document being a variation of said first document.*** See column 3, lines 35-67 and column 4, lines 1-38. Gay teaches receiving the first and second document via a website which meets the limitation, ***a processor for receiving said first document and said second document.*** See column 3, lines 35-67 and column 4, lines 1-38. Gay further teaches extracting a first valid character string from a previously existing financial document and comparing each string in a first/old document to the character strings in the new/second financial document which meets the limitation, ***a comparator executing on said processor for comparing said first document tabular data to related subject matter of said second document tabular data.*** See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Gay teaches the comparison of the two documents results in the creation of a second matrix of character strings provided on a second plane in the database including those textual strings that are not included in the first matrix of textual strings (from the first document) which meets the limitation ***generate tabular delta data indicative of at least one of change and percentage change between the related subject matter of said first document***

Art Unit: 2176

tabular data and said second document tabular data. See columns 5, lines 40-67 and column 6, lines 1-54.

EXAMINER NOTE: Determining which textual strings are new or not included in the first matrix of textual strings representing the first document and forming a second matrix is generating tabular delta data indicative of a "change" because it is identifying a new textual string in the second financial document which is considered a "change".

Regarding claim 28, claim 28 is drawn to a system for the apparatus claimed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 29, claim 29 is drawn to a method for the apparatus claimed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 9, Gay teaches comparing character strings provided in the previous financial document with the character strings in the second financial document which meets the limitation ***compare sections of the first document tabular data with related subject matter sections of said second document tabular data based on at least one of tables, graphs, columns, rows, time units, idea units and line items.*** See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Examiner Note: Line items are being interpreted as the character strings.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 10, Gay teaches the first and second document tabular data contains text data and the comparator generates the text/tabular delta data. See figure 1, column 2, lines 24-52, column 3, lines 35-66 and column 4.

Regarding claim 11, Gay teaches the delta data can include data that has been added in the new financial document. See column 2, lines 1-15 and column 9, lines 59-62.

Regarding claim 16, Gay teaches comparing character strings provided in the previous financial document with the character strings in the second financial document which meets the limitation ***compare sections of the first document text/tabular data with related subject matter sections of said second document text/tabular data based on at least one of tables, graphs, columns, rows, time units, idea units and line items***. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Examiner Note: Line items are being interpreted as the character strings.

Regarding claim 18, Gay teaches the first and second documents comprise data in a text format. See columns 1-2. Gay further teaches these documents include one or more lines of textual material and one or more columns of data associated with each line of textual material. See column 1, lines 35-46. The textual strings are separated into a separate column from the columns of numerical data. Before comparing the first

Art Unit: 2176

document to the second document, a first valid character string is extracted from the old/original document. See column 4, lines 14-38.

Regarding claim 19, Gay further teaches extracting a first valid character string from a previously existing financial document and comparing each string in a first/old document to the character strings in the new/second financial document. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Gay teaches the comparison of the two documents results in the creation of a second matrix of character strings provided on a second plane in the database including those textual strings that are not included in the first matrix of textual strings (from the first document) which meets the limitation ***generate text delta data***. See columns 5, lines 40-67 and column 6, lines 1-54.

Regarding claim 20, Gay teaches the delta data can include data that has been added in the new financial document. See column 2, lines 1-15 and column 9, lines 59-62.

Regarding claim 25, Gay teaches comparing character strings provided in the previous financial document with the character strings in the second financial document which meets the limitation ***compare sections of the first document text/tabular data with related subject matter sections of said second document text/tabular data based on at least one of tables, graphs, columns, rows, time units, idea units and***

Art Unit: 2176

line items. See figure 1, column 4, lines 14-67 and column 5, lines 1-40. Examiner

Note: Line items are being interpreted as the character strings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2-6, 12-15, 17, 21-24 and 26-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, US 6,792,145 B2, 09/14/04 (filed on 06/08/01) in view of Horton, US 2004/0230892 A1, 11/18/04 (filed 03/17/04, provisional application filed on 03/17/03).

Regarding claim 2, although Gay teaches storing the tabular data and tabular delta data in separate planes in a database, Gay does not disclose a user interface in communication with a processor for delivering at least one of said tabular data and tabular delta data. However, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously which meets the limitation, **a user**

interface for delivering at least one of said tabular data and tabular delta data.

See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 3, Gay does not teach the tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the tabular data. However, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein the differences are highlighted in order to make it easy to find the differences which meets the limitation, ***wherein said tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the tabular data.*** See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1. Highlighted the differences by italicizing certain words is providing a means to visually distinct the delta data from the tabular data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and

Art Unit: 2176

changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 4, Gay does not teach the tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the tabular data in one manner and the percentage change is represented in a second manner. However, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein the differences are highlighted in order to make it easy to find the differences which meets the limitation, *wherein said tabular delta data is delivered on a user interface as visually distinct from the tabular data in a first manner*. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1. Highlighted the differences by italicizing certain words is providing a means to visually distinct the delta data from the tabular data.

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 1 requires the generation delta data indicative of *at least one of change and percentage change*. In this instance, Examiner has relied upon Gay's teachings of generating delta data indicative of a change, not a percentage change since claim 1 only requires one of change or percentage change, not both.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 5, Gay does not teach displaying a plurality of visually distinct tabular delta data; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein the differences are highlighted in order to make it easy to find the differences which meets the limitation, ***a plurality of visually distinct tabular delta data***. page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1. Figure 1 displays multiple drafts indicating a plurality of differences.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a

simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 6, Gay does not teach that the tabular delta data delivered on the user interface is chronicled by at least one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units. However, Horton teaches delivering tabular delta data chronicled by a draft number relating to the version of the document. See figure 1.

Regarding claim 12, Gay does not teach a user interface for delivering at least one of said additions, deletions, substitutions, and text/tabular data; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein any additions, deletions, and substitutions are highlighted which meets the limitation, **a user interface for delivering at least one of said tabular data and tabular delta data**. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019], page 3, paragraph [0069], and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a

Art Unit: 2176

simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 13, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are visually distinct from the tabular data; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein any additions, deletions, and substitutions are highlighted which meets the limitation, ***wherein said additions, deletions, and substitutions data is delivered on said user interface as visually distinct from said text/tabular data***. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019], page 3, paragraph [0069], and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 12, from which claim 13 depends, recites delivering ***at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data***. Thus although claim 13 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and

Art Unit: 2176

substitutions data as visually distinct from the tabular data, claim 12 only requires that one of these data be displayed; therefore, Examiner is relying on the fact that Horton displays edited data in a different manner such as by italics.

Regarding claim 14, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are displayed in a third, fourth, and fifth manner respectively; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein any additions, deletions, and substitutions are highlighted which meets the limitation, *wherein said visually distinct additions data is represented in a third manner*. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019], page 3, paragraph [0069], and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 12, from which claim 14 depends, recites delivering *at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular*

Art Unit: 2176

data. Thus although claim 14 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a variety of manners, claim 12 only requires that one of these data be displayed, thus Examiner is relying on the fact that Horton displays edited data in a different manner such as by italics.

Regarding claim 15, Gay does not teach that one of the additions, substitutions, or deletions data delivered on the user interface is chronicled by at least one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units. However, Horton teaches delivering tabular delta data, indicative of changes made to the document, are chronicled by a draft number relating to the version of the document. See figure 1.

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 11, from which claim 15 depends, recites delivering *at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data*. Thus although claim 15 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a variety of manners, claim 11 only requires that one of these data be displayed.

Regarding claim 17, Gay does not teach integrated at least two of the tabular delta data, text/tabular delta data, tabular data, and text/tabular data for delivery on a user interface. Horton teaches integrating tabular delta data and tabular data for delivery on a user interface as depicted in claim 1. Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document

and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 21, Gay does not teach a user interface for delivering at least one of said additions, deletions, substitutions, and text/tabular data; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein any additions, deletions, and substitutions are highlighted which meets the limitation, ***a user interface for delivering at least one of said tabular data and tabular delta data***. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019], page 3, paragraph [0069], and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the

Art Unit: 2176

differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 22, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are visually distinct from the tabular data; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein any additions, deletions, and substitutions are highlighted which meets the limitation, *wherein said additions, deletions, and substitutions data is delivered on said user interface as visually distinct from said text/tabular data*. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019], page 3, paragraph [0069], and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Art Unit: 2176

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 21, from which claim 22 depends, recites delivering ***at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data***. Thus although claim 22 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data as visually distinct from the tabular data, claim 21 only requires that one of these data be displayed; therefore, Examiner is relying on the fact that Horton displays edited data in a different manner such as by italics.

Regarding claim 23, Gay does not teach the additions, deletions, and substitutions data are displayed in a third, fourth, and fifth manner respectively; however, Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously wherein any additions, deletions, and substitutions are highlighted which meets the limitation, ***wherein said visually distinct additions data is represented in a third manner***. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019], page 3, paragraph [0069], and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a

simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 21, from which claim 23 depends, recites delivering *at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data*. Thus although claim 23 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a variety of manners, claim 21 only requires that one of these data be displayed, thus Examiner is relying on the fact that Horton displays edited data in a different manner such as by italics.

Regarding claim 24, Gay does not teach that one of the additions, substitutions, or deletions data delivered on the user interface is chronicled by at least one of numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, and consecutive sequence units. However, Horton teaches delivering tabular delta data, indicative of changes made to the document, are chronicled by a draft number relating to the version of the document. See figure 1.

EXAMINER NOTE: Claim 20, from which claim 24 depends, recites delivering *at least one of said additions data, deletions data, substitutions data, and text/tabular data*. Thus although claim 24 recites displaying the additions, deletions, and substitutions data in a variety of manners, claim 20 only requires that one of these data be displayed.

Regarding claim 26, Gay does not teach integrated at least two of the tabular delta data, text/tabular delta data, tabular data, and text/tabular data for delivery on a

Art Unit: 2176

user interface. Horton teaches integrating tabular delta data and tabular data for delivery on a user interface as depicted in claim 1. Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

Regarding claim 27, Gay does not teach integrated at least one of text/tabular delta data and text/tabular data for delivery on a user interface. Horton teaches integrating tabular delta data and tabular data for delivery on a user interface as depicted in claim 1. Horton teaches a system and method for document project management in which the original portion of a document and each of a plurality of proposed revisions are displayed simultaneously. See page 1, paragraphs [0012]-[0019] and figure 1.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Horton's display of a portion of the original document and changes to that portion in a graphical user interface in Gay's system for storing the differences between financial documents in a database because it enables a user to simultaneously view the differences between various versions of the same document. This was desirable at the time of the invention in order to provide a user with a simultaneous, side-by-side comparison of the differences between documents. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0015].

13. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, US 6,792,145 B2, 09/14/04 (filed on 06/08/01) in view of Horton, US 2004/0230892 A1, 11/18/04 (filed 03/17/04, provisional application filed on 03/17/03), as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Zilberman, US 2006/0167772 A1, 07/27/06 (filed 10/30/02, provisional application filed on 10/30/02).

Regarding claim 7, neither Gay nor Horton teaches inserting a graphic into the tabular delta data indicative of change magnitude for each change between related subject matter of the first tabular data and the second document tabular data; however, Zilberman teaches an electronic interpretation of financials in which financial inputs related to an entity are evaluated against predetermined values. See abstract, page 1, paragraphs [0006]-[0011]. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated

Art Unit: 2176

relationships such as the change and percentage change between previous periods which meets the limitation *inserting a graphic into the tabular delta data indicative of change magnitude for each change between related subject matter of the first tabular data and the second document tabular data*. See page 6, paragraph [0068]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's insertion of a graphic depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay/Horton because it would visually display comparisons of information with previous periods, industry averages, etc. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

Regarding claim 8, neither Gay nor Horton teaches the graphic is comprised of at least one of graphs, charts, statistics, and images. Zilberman's system includes graphics capabilities so that in addition to outputting text, graphs and charts can be output to illustrate the evaluated relationships. See page 6, paragraph [0068]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Zilberman's insertion of a graphic depicting the change between financial information in the system of Gay/Horton because it would visually display comparisons of information with previous periods, industry averages, etc. See page 6, paragraph [0068].

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Forster US 2004/0220980 A1
- b. Guy et al. US 2005/0154664 A1
- c. Weinberg et al. US 2002/0116417 A1
- d. Brandenberger US 2004/0054967 A1
- e. Schulze et al. US 6,446,072 B1
- f. Sites US 6,324,555 B1
- g. Ferguson et al. US 6,336,094 B1
- h. Chow et al. US 6,029,175
- i. Cooper, James, et al, Detecting Similar Documents Using Salient Terms, November -9, 2002 CIKM '02. Pages 245-251.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Rachna Singh
09/11/06